



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,742	11/30/2001	Davin C. Dillon	210121.491C7	3670

500 7590 04/15/2003

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 6300
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

STRZELECKA, TERESA E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,742

Applicant(s)

DILLON ET AL.

Examiner

Teresa E Strzelecka

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 14-16, 18-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 9-13 and 17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 9-13 and 17 have not been further treated on the merits.

Election/Restrictions

2. Each Group detailed below reads on patentably distinct Groups drawn to multiple SEQ ID Numbers. The sequences are patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, and a further restriction is applied to each Group. For an elected Group drawn to amino acid or nucleic acid sequences, the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid or a single nucleic acid sequence (See MPEP 803.04).
3. It is noted that the restriction Groups are set forth as Groups I-VII for convenience. However, each restriction Group actually comprises the numbers of Groups which read on each patentably distinct nucleic acid, polypeptide, fusion protein or antibody specificity.
4. In addition, it is noted that claim 7, drawn to a fusion protein comprising at least one polypeptide according to claim 2 would be subject to further restriction, as each fusion protein comprising more than one polypeptide would differ in structure and modes of action to such extent as to be considered patentably distinct.
5. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8 and 15, drawn to an isolated polynucleotide comprising a sequence provided in SEQ ID NO: 1-38, 42-205, 207, 210-290, 293, 296, 297, 300 and 302-305, oligonucleotide that hybridizes to it and a kit comprising the polynucleotide, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1, and in class 435, subclass 810, for example.

- II. Claim 2 drawn to an isolated polypeptide comprising a sequence provided in SEQ ID NO: 39-41, 206, 208, 209, 294, 295, 301, 306 and 307, classified in class 530, subclass 300, for example.
- III. Claims 5 and 16, drawn to an antibody to a polypeptide and a kit comprising the antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1, and in class 435, subclass 810, for example.
- IV. Claim 6, drawn to a method for determining the presence or absence of cancer in a patient, comprising contacting a biological sample obtained from a patient with a binding agent which binds to the polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.
- V. Claim 7, drawn to a fusion protein, classified in class 536, subclass 23.4.
- VI. Claim 14, drawn to a method for determining the presence of cancer in a patient, comprising contacting a biological sample obtained from a patient with an oligonucleotide, class 435, subclass 6, for example.
- VII. Claims 18-21, drawn to a method for determining presence of cancer in a patient, by contacting a sample with monoclonal antibody which binds to O8E, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

6. Inventions I and (II and V) are separate and distinct because the inventions are directed to different chemical types regarding the critical limitations therein. For Groups II and V, the critical feature is a polypeptide whereas for Group I the critical feature is a polynucleotide. It is acknowledged that various processing steps may cause a polypeptide of Groups II and V to be directed as to its synthesis by a polynucleotide of Group I, however, the completely separate

Art Unit: 1637

chemical types of the inventions of Groups I and (II and V) supports the undue search burden if both were examined together. Additionally, polypeptides have been most commonly, albeit not always, separately characterized and published in the Biochemical literature, thus significantly adding to the search burden if examiner together, as compared to being searched separately. Also, it is pointed out that processing that may connect two groups does not prevent them from being viewed as distinct, because enough processing can result in producing any composition from any other composition if the processing is not so limited to additions, subtractions, enzyme actions, etc.

7. Inventions I and III are separate and distinct, as the claims of Invention I are drawn to polynucleotides, while the claims of Group III are drawn to an antibody. These are differing biochemical entities having differing biochemical properties, structures and effects. Invention III would require searching in areas unrelated to polynucleotides, and as such, would require an undue burden on the examiner if not restricted.

8. Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polynucleotide of Group I is not required for the method of Group IV.

9. Inventions I and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotide of Group I could be used for an entirely different purpose such as in making the polypeptide of Group II, rather than in the method of Group VI.

10. Inventions I and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polynucleotide of Group I is not required for the method of Group VII.

11. Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group II could be used for an entirely different purpose such as in the method of Group IV, rather than for the production of antibodies of Group III.

12. Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group II could be used for an entirely different purpose such as in the production of antibodies of Group II, rather than for the method of Group IV.

13. Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are a polypeptide and a fusion polypeptide, and these are two different entities with different functions and different modes of operation.

14. Inventions II and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polypeptide of Group II is not required for the method of Group VI.

15. Inventions II and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polypeptide of Group II is not required for the method of Group VII.

16. Inventions III and (IV, VI, VII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the antibody of Group III is not required for the methods of Groups IV, VI and VII.

17. Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are an antibody and a fusion polypeptide, and these are two different entities with different functions and different modes of operation.

18. Inventions (IV, VI, VII) and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In

Art Unit: 1637

the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the fusion polypeptide of Group V is not required for the methods of Groups IV, VI and VII.

19. Inventions IV and (VI, VII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to methods which have different method steps, starting materials and goals.

20. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

21. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

22. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Teresa E Strzelecka whose telephone number is (703) 306-5877. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones can be reached at (703) 308-1152. The fax phone numbers for the organization

Application/Control Number: 10/010,742

Page 8

Art Unit: 1637

where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

April 12, 2003

Teresa Strzelecka, Ph. D.

Patent Examiner

Teresa Strzelecka

4/14/03